



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_34587
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Assessment of the Physiological and Granules Size Distribution of Starch from Variety of Cassava, Sweet Potato and Cocoyam
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Title: -This section isn't adequate for the manuscript content. 1-In this manuscript, the authors give the data on some functional properties and granule size distribution of starches from variety of cassava, sweet potato and cocoyam. Moreover, granule shape is given by the authors. Granule size and shape constitutes the morphological characteristics. 2-the word "physiological" isn't appropriated for the title. "Physiological" differ to "functional". The authors should improve the title. Introduction -This section should be updated (recently published literature should be cited). Old references should be replaced by recent references. Materials and methods In this section, the authors should include statistical analysis. They should also add the used multiple range test. Results and Discussion The standard deviations don't appear in table 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3. The authors should include them in these tables. When there are meaningful differences at 0.05 level, the authors should write "meaningful differences ($p \leq 0.05$)" instead of "meaningful differences ($p \geq 0.05$)"	Done, little resent literatures exist in the area of research. Topic corrected. ANOVA and LSD was used to establish significance and separation of means. P-value corrected Statistical analyses add Other corrections done



SDI Review Form 1.6

	(line 198, 210, 286, 300, 308, 331 and sample abstract section (results: line 1)). The authors should also correct them. On the other hand, they should write “not significant differences ($p>.05$)” instead of “not significant differences ($p\leq.05$)” when there aren’t significant differences at 0.05 level (line 320).	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	-The study carried out is of topicality and interest for all food scientists, especially the physic-chemists in starch and starchy-polysaccharides. -Methodologies are well-planned and sufficiently describes, though further details need to be given about some sections. Results are well-shown, analyzed and discussed. -Paper should be strictly formatted according AJOB format. -Referencing of referred papers should be done properly. -The authors should completely read the Author's Instruction and correct references in the text and references section ([1], [2], [10], [13], [16], [19], [20], [23], [26], [30], [31], [32], [38], [39], [45], [48] and [52])	